DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 362 957 EA 025 323

AUTHOR Donaldson, Gordon A., Jr.; And Others
TITLE Leadership Development in Action: Learning in the Maelstrom.
PUB DATE Apr 93
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cognitive Style; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership; *Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Training; *Outcomes of Education; *Professional Development; Public Schools
IDENTIFIERS *Maine Academy for School Leaders

ABSTRACT

Educators have voiced concern that leadership development has not been a part of their graduate education. But little is known about how leaders learn and how that learning affects their behavior and their success on the job. School leaders participating in a program at the Main Academy for School Leaders examined the connections between leaders' learning, their behaviors, and student outcomes. Since January 1992, 66 teachers and administrators have developed Leadership Development Plans (LDPs), carried out these plans in their work places, and evaluated the progress and results. In phase I, school leadership needs were evaluated, leader readiness determined, and goals established. In phase II, members developed LDPs, which were implemented and evaluated in phase III. Three styles of leadership learning and action were identified: (1) think it through, act, then think back; (2) act it out, then sort it out; (3) clarify what should happen, try to make it happen, evaluate progress. The study revealed that the transition from a cognitive-based learning model to a field-based one is difficult. No learning style is best in all situations. Leadership styles should take greater advantage of learning opportunities in the workplace. Lastly, structures that support adult learning are central to success. (JPT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 362 957

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN ACTION: LEARNING IN THE MAELSTROM

Gordon A. Donaldson, Jr. University of Maine
Richard Barnes, University of Southern Maine
George Mamik, Maine Academy of School Leaders
Susan Martin, Maine Academy of School Leaders

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R.E. Barnes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A paper presented at the Annual Meeting
of the American Educational Research Association
Atlanta, GA April 1993

EA 025 323

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN ACTION: LEARNING IN THE MAELSTROM

Gordon Donaldson, University of Maine
Richard Barnes, University of Southern Maine
George Marnik, Maine Academy for School Leaders
Susan Martin, Maine Academy for School Leaders

Leaders do not develop in university classrooms, they develop on the job. For decades now, the field of educational leadership has echoed with this cry. Principals, superintendents, school board members, and teachers have repeatedly voiced concern that developing practical leadership competencies has not been a part of their own graduate education or that of the leaders with whom they work. Gradually, universities and professional leadership organizations have supported this view as well (National Commission for the Principalship, 1990; NASSP, 1992)

For all the apparent consensus behind this view, the field has found it extraordinarily difficult to devise learning experiences that will generate leadership competencies for school leaders. Internships, practica, institutes, principals' centers and academies, and innovative assessment and curricular practices have each contributed to the effort. But our learning about *how leaders learn and how that learning affects their behaviors and their success on the job* remains rudimentary. The action of school leadership, the absence of time to reflect on and systematically study leaders, and the "space" between universities and schools conspire against our best efforts.

This paper explores the frontiers of our learning about how school leaders develop. It reports the early experiences of the Maine Academy for School Leaders, a program that makes connections between leaders' learning, their behaviors on the job, and student outcomes. Fifty-eight school leaders—47% of them teachers, 47% principals and teaching principals, 74% women—have since January 1992 funneled their professional development energies toward specifying leadership behaviors to improve, developing Leadership Development Plans (LDPs), marshaling resources and support to "work" these plans in their worksites, and continuously evaluating progress and resetting objectives. This paper reports the varieties of learning styles Maine leaders exhibited as they attempted to improve their in-action leadership behaviors.

The Maine Academy for School Leaders

The Maine Academy for School Leaders is one of five innovative leadership development projects funded through an eighteen month U.S. Department of Education grant to the Maine Leadership Consortium in October, 1991. The Academy's goal is to create innovative leadership development programs for a wide variety of school site players: teachers, principals, counselors, parents, board members. It is particularly to encourage minorities and women to move into leadership roles in Maine schools. From 170 applicants, 66 practicing and prospective leaders were chosen for the Academy from districts covering a wide geographic area. Since January 1992, these leaders have participated in activities designed to "build capacity" for leadership in each member as well as in the Academy network as a whole. These activities fit into three phases. (see Appendix A)

During Phase I, the Academy asked each member to assess the leadership needs of his/her environment and his/her readiness to respond to those needs and then to begin targeting specific behavioral goals for "growing" his/her leadership competencies. Members used a three-dimensional model of leadership knowledge developed by the Academy that integrates cognitive, interpersonal, and intrapersonal learning as a means of applying new insights to one's own behavior on the job. (see Appendix B)

In Phase II, an intensive institute in July 1992, members created Leadership Development Plans (LDPs) which identified goals to change their own leadership behavior in schools. The justification for each plan needed to show how such changes would either affect students directly or, more commonly, affect how faculty and staff functioned and how that, in turn, would positively impact student outcomes. Members were required to include in their LDPs developmental goals in the interpersonal, intrapersonal, and cognitive dimensions and to make these mutually reinforcing.

Phase III—the "action phase"—lasts throughout the 1992-93 school year. Members have been "working their plans" in their schools and communities, attempting to adopt new behaviors with others in order to move their schools forward. Two full-time Academy Facilitators and

Support and Development Teams of three or four Academy colleagues observe, critique, and support members in their attempts to change how they actually act on the job. Members also meet in Northern and Southern Networks and are linked through an electronic bulletin board.

Examining Leader Learning Styles

The authors are the staff of the Maine Academy and have worked extensively with all Academy members over the past year. Each member has created a variety of documents as he or she has moved through the three phases, providing a rich basis for their own professional portfolios as well as this research effort. Central to this documentation are: initial assessments of their workplace's leadership needs; initial assessments of their capacities to respond to these needs; successive drafts of the LDP; successive reflective and response journal entries; colleague observations of leadership behaviors related to LDP goals; ongoing fieldnotes written by the two Facilitators.

The Maine Academy curriculum, from the outset, operated on the principle that adults' most profound learning is internally driven and idiosyncratically defined by both individual and context. Certainly, learning of this sort—profound enough that it affects positively a leader's behaviors—has been the Academy's goal. Drawing on the literature on adult learning and experiential learning in education (Schon, 1983, 1987; Kolb, 1984; Levine, 1989; Ackerman, 1991), the Academy structured its curriculum to challenge and support leaders to define their own learning goals and seek resources to fulfill them. Our only stricture was that these goals involve actual on-the-job behaviors and that these be tied, at least theoretically, to specified student outcomes. From the beginning, we expected to witness a variety of approaches and experiences among the original 66 Academy members. We knew neither what that variety would be nor whether certain styles of learning would be more effective than others.

The authors have, in pursuit of these two goals, scanned all primary level documents authored by Academy members. These sources, reinforced by Facilitators' extenstive first-hand contacts, demonstrated best the ways each leader constructed his or her learning goals and tasks and interpreted his or her learning experiences. Indeed, they proved richer

than we imagined. Repeated scanning produced an array of samples of "thinking about leadership learning". These samples were categorized and recategorized as the authors sought the schema that best represented most members' approaches to learning. From these the four authors developed a working hypothesis about styles of leadership learning.

Before turning to the three dominant styles that emerged from this work, we wish to note the difficulty we experienced with a special subset of Academy members. We came to refer to these as the "marginally engaged" members. They were the approximately eight leaders who, despite our efforts, consistently spoke little, wrote little, and participated on the margins of Academy activities. Their learning remains a mystery to us and, for that reason, we cannot include them in this review. We have learned, however, not to discount them; we have been surprised throughout the Academy by counterintuitive discoveries: members who "looked like they were getting it" suddenly seeming "not to get it" and others who "looked out of it" suddenly demonstrating extraordinary insight into themselves and their work.

Ways of Learning About My Leadership: Three Styles

We regard the following typology as a working hypothesis. We suggest that these three styles describe important differences in how leaders learn; they are however neither an exhaustive nor a thoroughly tested list of types. As with all working hypotheses, they should both inspire new thinking and invite readers to respond. From these activities will come a new and hopefully more accurate rendition of this scheme that will be useful to both school leaders and professional development designers.

We found that the three types of learning identified from members' experiences were not mutually exclusive. That is, a single individual could (and often did) demonstrate tendencies from more than one style. In this regard, it is important in the following pages to remember that these descriptions often do not accurately depict *individuals*. Most Academy members, while they exhibited stronger tendencies toward one style, slipped into aspects of others. In fact, on the premise that each style has its benefits, the Academy curriculum often encouraged broadening

learning from one's customary and comfortable style into others. Table 1 offers a preliminary summary of the three styles. (Table 2 near the end provides more detail.)

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF STYLES OF LEADERSHIP LEARNING

STYLE I	STYLE II	STYLE III
Think ->Understand ->Do	Do ->Understand ->Think	Understand ->Do ->Think
Rely on cognitive schema	Rely on intuition	Rely on ideal models of self/workplace
Learning skills: organize, plan, act, evaluate	Skills: act, feel, reflect listen	Skills: clarify mission, persuade, implement, re-set
Confidence from articulating thoughts/plans	Confidence from feelings, responses of colleagues	Confidence from sense of conviction
Primary learning mode: HEAD	Primary learning mode: HANDS	Primary learning mode: HEART/SOUL

Style I: Think It Through, Act, Then Think Back

For a sizable number of Academy members, learning to improve leadership is primarily a cognitive activity. Style I learning involves intense engagement in thinking through their leadership situation in an effort to understand it before they act. One teacher leader echoed this orientation when he wrote, "I hate to do before I know what I'm doing." Another, after struggling to understand his school and his role in it, wrote:

> The Academy...has forced me to examine carefully my role in a complex structure; to begin to quantify my behaviors in such a way that I can use the data I collect to impact the school; to articulate the improvements that I would like to see in myself, in the school, and in the staff in such a way that others can understand them and that they can be measured.

In a similar vein, a woman sees the improvement of her leadership as "an exercise in analysis and logic [in which] I'm pulling [my leadership] apart." Style I learners welcome—and perhaps make best use of—the Academy's formal curriculum for assessing themselves and their schools, setting

goals logically linked to that assessment, projecting what they need to do to improve, and laying out a sequential and logical plan to carry out the improvement.

Leaders who learn mainly through Style I seem to relish finding and amplifying a schema **to provide a vocabulary of concepts** for understanding and articulating their leadership situations. They often derive these from style inventories, articles, coursework and books which they use as "advanced organizers" for action: "One thing I've learned about myself is that I enjoy thinking forward; I do not think backwards very well... [Steven Covey's *Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*] is excellent, there is so much stuff in it to go over and over, again and again..." Indeed, Academy members who have taken courses in administration/leadership seem to have the advantage of cognitive schema with which to organize their experience. Their reliance on it, however, made timing a key factor in the utility of these formal learning activities:

> Theories of Administration was an interesting class, but, as a new Principal, I was mainly interested in how my own organization fit into that information... Now I am ready to learn about [theories] in general and [how they] effect me, sometimes directly, sometimes indirectly, and sometimes, not at all—YET.

Style I learners appear to need these **cognitive schema** so they can **predict and plan** how their own leader behaviors will or might work out. In their intense efforts to **put all the pieces** of their leadership together **into a coherent picture**, they strive intellectually to organize themselves and their leadership activities. One male teacher wrote that his major LDP goal in December was to "establish a more conscious awareness of my strengths and weaknesses [and in particular] to become more aware of my tendency to act before I have developed a case for my actions". Progress on his plan consisted of succeeding in "separating in my own mind those elements I have control over and those that I do not, hoping in so doing that I would be able to limit my worrying to the former. Lo and behold, it worked!"

Often, for Style I learners, their **ability to express their thoughts and plans** was tantamount to feeling they were in control, in charge, and capable as leaders. Another teacher wrote, "I need to consciously continue practicing in my workplace the styles of leadership that work best in various situations". Indeed, some leaders discovered that they had come to overrely

on "thinking things through" in order to "be right" all the time as leaders. Through the Academy, the limitations of this "thinking" style have begun to come clear:

> I no longer have to present my best on the first go around. I realize that doing that put me in a position of defending my position because I had put so much effort into it rather than sharing ideas with other people and coming to a conclusion later. I find it's okay to say, 'I hadn't thought about that'.

Style I learners confront their share of dilemmas as they strive for an orderly or coherent concept map for their leadership experience. In their effort to **think about** their schools and themselves **and thereby to understand** them so that they may "logically lead", Style I learners risk being paralyzed either by their own cognitive and theoretic limitations or by the chaotic nature of schools. For many, the largest puzzles stem from interpersonal and intrapersonal events that do not fit rationally or predictably into their cognitive schema. Style I learners usually struggle to "get a grip" on these affective events; when they do, these seem major breakthroughs in their leadership learning:

> Before my involvement in the Academy I would have placed school leadership as working mostly in the cognitive dimension...[Now, I have an] increased awareness of the importance of working both in the interpersonal and the intrapersonal dimensions. This awareness...has provided me with a new awareness of the skills, interests, and personality preferences that I bring to my job...I see myself re-creating my position next year to better reflect my skills and those of my staff.

Unlike this teaching principal, a number of Academy members continue to struggle with fitting their schools and colleagues into their "conceptual map", rather than adapting their maps to their schools.

In summary, Style I learning **occurs largely through the head.** (Sergiovanni, 1992) Style I learners see their leadership through primarily cognitive, intellectual lenses. Learning how to improve requires opening to reconsideration their current "knowledge" and theoretical structures, seeking new theories and insights that better reflect themselves and their schools, and using those to improve how they and their colleagues work. The Academy, for Style I learners, is a golden opportunity to find new "ideas" about leadership, to work these into their schema, and then to adjust their behaviors on the job. As one teacher put it, "I fully see leadership as a journey taken on in an internal landscape before it is practiced in the real world."

Style II: Act it Out, Then Sort it Out

Leaders who learn in Style II, in distinction to Style I learners, do not feel a need to understand a situation before they can act in it. They typically **plunge into action**, trusting that their **intuitive grasp on themselves and their workplaces** will, through the millstone of experience, **be refined and extended**. This approach is typified by one principal who wrote, "I work best with the inductive approach which means for me I don't need all the questions answered before I begin... I am learning not only to continue to trust others but to begin to trust myself. It feels good". Often, Style II learning results from changing not how one thinks, but how one interacts with others at work. One female assistant principal wrote:

> Prior to the Academy...I was constantly frustrated by [two male teachers'] treatment of me and personalized their criticisms of anything within the school. Now, I've decided to try to understand where they are coming from instead of making them understand where I am coming from. This has made all the difference in the world. In order to do that I have had to rely on new listening techniques ... to react less, demonstrate empathy, and avoid the need to defend my actions. As a result, I have an entirely new relationship with these two people in particular and other teachers as well.

Style II learners **rely heavily on experience**, on the **cues** they pick up from colleagues **on the job**, and on **talking** with trusted friends. Their learning activities, however, are not wholly articulable; their activity tends to involve synthesizing from experience rather than analyzing experience. Learning evolves from **finding out how a new leadership practice feels in action, then reflecting on it.** When this happen in the workplace, Academy members feel great progress. One high school department chairperson wrote,

> I only learn by listening carefully and sincerely... If I don't like someone I must make the effort to listen to him or her carefully, to ask the sorts of questions that elicit substantive answers, to recognize that this person provides a viewpoint I need... I've discovered that by listening sincerely to different points of view I've cut down on the everyday conflicts within the department.

Sometimes it is the Academy's hands-on curriculum that supported Style II learning. Another high school department head wrote that:

> Learning about my own leadership increases when I work with other people. Role playing (even though I am a reticent participant) was very beneficial in helping me, for I was forced to move from thinking to acting... Group discussion and triads were valuable in helping me to clarify my ideas... Having anecdotal information

> about myself [in a journal also] assists me in making an inventory of my behaviors, fears, and attitudes in the area of leadership.

Academy leaders find the most helpful aids to this type of learning to be empathetic listeners, the "stories" of other leaders in both oral and written form, and style inventories that, as one leader said, "help me find out why I have been doing things this way [on the job]".

In the Academy structure, leaders who tend toward Style II sometimes feel that they are not making progress as leaders because they cannot talk about their experience in as organized and articulate a manner as Style I learners do. Often, they feel they are "task oriented, nuts and bolts kinds of people [pitted against people who are] content to discuss philosophy". Indeed, Academy members displaying Style II learning tend to be teachers or leaders who have little formal immersion in coursework or leadership literature. Importantly, however, many possess a quiet confidence, particularly in their ability to form relationships with others that will make their work experiences positive. **Articulating leadership knowledge is secondary to action** for them. The ultimate test of their leadership success is not, "Can I Say It?" but "Can I Do It?" One elementary teacher wrote with characteristic humility:

> Mine has been a tentative approach to leadership...I was afraid to ask questions, aware of the general disapproval of upsetting or enlarging the apple cart [for my colleagues and administrators]... I was quick to back down, to accept the pat answer, and to apologize bodily and verbally. [Now I see that my] raising questions without pursuing the answers is not leadership. I might just do it!

Part of learning, for Style II, is **trusting others to teach us** how well or poorly something we do works with them. Many lessons for Style II learners are **about themselves and how they work with others**:

> I need time to practice these ideas/strategies in a safe setting. I then mentally visualize the application in a real setting. After the "real thing", I need to be required to honestly assess my success and appreciate direct feedback from fellow participants and observers.

For many in the Academy, the full-time Facilitators and the Support and Development Team have provided a regular network of opportunities to talk, reflect, and come to understandings about oneself. These lessons often involve moving from intuitive knowledge to more conscious knowledge:

> [I've learned that] my favorite mistake is making assumptions, and I pay dearly for it... my intuitive sense is so strong that I think I understand things without checking them out. I think that I have hung on to assumptions more out of bad habit than necessity... [As I learn to confront my assumptions] there will be group process payoffs... as others will know I'm really listening to them if I go to the trouble of finding out clearly and throughly what they are saying...

The challenge for most Style II learners in the Academy has been to sustain belief in themselves as leaders when they feel inarticulate or barren of elaborate strategies for themselves or their schools. In a sense, Style II learners are least able to feel competent as leaders when they are not in their workplace, surrounded by all the immediate experience of their leadership relationships. As one assistant principal put it to her Academy Facilitator: "Perhaps we need to meet [more often]. I don't think about these things all the time. I need someone sitting here like you to remind me, to raise challenges [to how I see what I do here]". For them, too, it is easy to just let examination of their own leadership be washed asunder by the action of school. Making sense of their experience is not something their workplaces or their egos always support:

> What I have learned about learning to lead is that it is very hard work. Not hard work in the sense of hours or labor, but in the sense of being able and willing to really examine what you do. To get to the real issue of leadership and the skills needed to be an effective leader, I have had to break down a barrier of sorts, to stop pointing the finger at some other issues, not make excuses, but really be willing to say to myself, "This is the issue, now learn to deal with it".

Style II learners seem able to make greatest strides when they have **a supportive professional development milieu that is engaged in their workplaces and worklives** so that issues of practice can be brought to the surface and examined.

For many who have tendencies toward Style II learning, the Maine Academy provided such a workplace-centered opportunity. If Style I learners learn best through their "heads", Style II's **learn best through their hands.** Their learning is often at the behavioral level; their biggest strides have been the result of coaching that uses their own behavioral data. The visits of Support and Development Team colleagues and the Facilitator as well as feedback from work colleagues give them a steady flow of such data. The richest gains in learning for these leaders tends to be in developing new appreciation for themselves as leaders in the context of their workplaces:

> I felt [at the outset of the Academy] that...I was unable to exercise leadership at school, beyond my own classroom. I perceived all the hurdles as outside of

> myself—my principal's attitudes and contol, time, the resignation of other people...[Now] there has been an intrapersonal [knowledge] shift for me. This year I know I am a leader, and that I need to create leadership from myself. I have taken on projects in the school that I could have done two years ago, but because of the perception mentioned above I didn't...
> Knowing that leadership comes from my own efforts, conversations, behaviors, and attitudes, while confronting at times, has actually freed me up to begin working for change in the school, instead of waiting for someone to create the perfect leadership role for me. I know I have a certain amount of power to change our school, through projects and other traditional roles, but also through being positive, communicating authentically, and sharing my learning with others.

Style III: Clarify What Should Happen, Try to Make it Happen, Evaluate Progress

Style III learning is dominated by the learner's **strong model of the ideal school and ideal leader.** Academy members who display such learning have heavy ideological keels that continually "right" their leadership thoughts, acts, and feelings when uncertainty intrudes. One lead teacher wrote, "The goal should be for current school leaders to look to the models we've studied/practiced as a goal toward which they are actively moving, and for prospective school leaders to BEGIN by using the "ideal" as a model..." These ideals might be drawn from any source—the restructuring literature, "moral leadership" or "community of learner" principles, or one's own philosophical or religious base—but are accompanied by a **sense of deep conviction about their "rightness".** One teacher leader said, "I know where I want the [group] to go but I don't know what road we'll take to get there... [I am working on a statement of my own credo because] I have to [clarify] what I stand for so that we can go on together".

These leaders appear to **need to understand where they and their schools need to go before taking action.** Their ideals guide decisions about what they "should" do as leaders more than does a structure of theory, ideas, or even immediate feedback from colleagues or the workplace. Hence, their **learning** as leaders is often directed toward **acquiring new means** of making things work the way the model says they should. One leader saw herself largely as a change agent and this at first dominated her approach to leading: "Prior to the Academy, I spent precious little time thinking about leadership, but rather how change happens". As a result, she was often "judgmental and critical" of others in her work based on their support for her blueprint

for instituting change. Her learning focused on how to "work her plan" around or through these obstacles. Such leaders have clear ends in sight; they think of learning as finding new strategies and techniques to reach their goals. One high school principal wrote,

> I learned a lot of "tricks" from my colleagues and applied them in other settings. The "medium sized group process" has been a valuable "bullet" to have been exposed to for me as I have seen it used in other settings and have applied it to my own work as well... I learn best about my own leadership by assessing what kinds of successful activities and changes are occurring around me [and adapting them to my own uses].

Style III learning also involves **thinking about why one's actions do or do not reach the visualized ideal.** This type of learning has often led to more profound change than the acquisition-of-new-strategies approach. One principal wrote,

> I was convinced [when we began] that a good leader should "fix" all problems so that everyone's self worth and self esteem was kept intact. However, [I learned that] this style of leadership allows for no individual growth...no opportunities for teachers to acquire the skills necessary to improve their self-worth and personal capabilities...

This kind of learning seems to stem from the leader's recognition—often after feeling some failure—that his or her ideal might not be wholly appropriate for his or her school or colleagues. Such realizations often follow long periods of **frustration based on "real world data" (both internal and external) that shows that the world is not "up to" the model yet.** Deeply held convictions make it especially difficult to recognize these "disconnects" between "ought" and "is". Their recognition usually drives the leader's learning in one of two directions: examining what is wrong with the world so I can change it OR examining what is wrong with me because I can't change it. For example, one principal wrote,

> My Leadership Development Plan was the result of the [Academy retreat] summer session; that is, it was constructed in wonderful vacuum. In spite of my best intentions, a real effort to get ideas from other people, and a sort of agonizing introspection, my LDP came up wide of the mark of what was necessary for me and my school. My goals, which made sense at the time [of the summer session], seemed to go right out the window when I got back to school and discussed them with the staff. [As wonderful as they were,] they were the result of my misunderstanding of the dynamics of team-building, my failure to comprehend the interpersonal dynamics that go on between team members, and my initial optimism...

Recognizing the disconnects requires affirmation from trusted friends and/or "fellow believers". Some learn to adjust their models and ideals while, more often, they alter their strategies for leading without compromising their goals. An example comes from a lead teacher attempting to convince parents of the merits of a new curriculum project:

> I erred strategically [last fall in my meeting with parents]. Not one parent ventured down to talk to me. I understood what had happened intellectually, but I couldn't accept it...By the next morning, in a calmer mood I talked to [the principal] about it... From this [statement of the] problem, I glimpsed an opportunity. I would try again at parent-teacher conference night to meet with parents and I would roll with the punches. If one strategy didn't work immediately, I would try to size up the situation and make adjustments. I succeeded in this. The evening did not go exactly as I planned, but it was fine...even better in some ways than I had imagined.

Because they see themselves carrying the "mantle of responsibility" for moving their schools to the ideal, a common malady shared by Style III learners is feeling responsible for the school's failure because they can't make the school go their way. For many Style III's, the personal stakes in their learning-about-leadership seem higher than for I's and II's. As one principal put it, "All these visions...are exciting and worthwhile yet getting there has created enormous stress for me as the leader".

Style III learners can be understood both to lead and to **learn through the heart and soul**. For them, it is a difficult journey because they care so much and are committed so deeply to their view of an excellent school led by a superb leader. Often, their lessons lead them back to themselves and the task of bringing their desire for the best into synch with the realities around them: "The most important lesson I've learned is that the way something is presented [can be] more important than the "something" itself... It goes along with learning to slow down and accept people as they are, not where I think they should be". As lessons about how one can improve leadership sink home, they often mean changing behaviors that the leader feels a major stake in. That process requires a great deal of support.

<u>Lessons Learned from our Emerging Model</u>

The staff and members of the Maine Academy for School Leaders have only begun to understand how leaders learn within the context of their workplaces. Clearly, understanding how

TABLE 2
AN EMERGING MODEL OF LEADERSHIP LEARNING STYLES
FROM THE MAINE ACADEMY OF SCHOOL LEADERS

	Style I	Style II	Style III
1. Initial self-perception as:			
a. an educator	a. "developer of intellect, values, future citizens"	a. "teacher at heart," "doer"	a. "dedicated to soc./personal growth"
b. a leader	b. "organizer," "sense maker,"	b. not sure I am one	b. "change master," "social transformer"
2. Sequential relationship of thought, action and understanding	Think –>Understand –>Do	Do –>Understand–>Think	Understand –>Do–>Think
3. Basic "vocabulary of terms" for learning how to lead	ideas, concepts, beliefs, schema, often from formal sources	experiences past and current; relationships with colleagues/ students	philosophy, mission, ideology, values; "fellow travelers"
4. Skills/habits of heart, hand and mind central to learning process	organizing ideas, activities, people/ cognitive/predicting	forming relationships/talking and listening about experience/doing the "nuts & bolts"/feeling	persuading/showing others the way/strategic planning/learning leadership strategies and techniques
5. Major learning dilemmas faced	"computing" inter– and intrapersonal events; need to act before understanding	feeling out of control/directionless/ foggy about ideas and "good reasons" for actions	"disconnect" between ideal and real/overlook realities in rush to reach ideal
6. Aspects of Maine Academy that have supported learning the most	1. LDP structure 2. Networking new concepts, literature 3. Formal presentations	1. Facilitator visits 2. S & D Team sessions 3. Learning new processes for reflection	1. Formal sessions 2. S & D if "fellow travelers" 3. Facilitators as support and sources of techniques
7. Primary learning mode:	HEAD	HANDS	HEART/SOUL

school leaders learn, how that learning affects leadership behaviors and, ultimately, how those behaviors shape the learning of students is complex. The descriptors outlined for the three learning styles are only a first step toward this understanding.

Moving to implications, we see four lessons that might be of use to others working in the field to the professional development of school leaders?

First, **the transition from a cognitive, university-based model to one grounded in the school setting can be arduous.** The learning style of each individual and his/her openness to change are critical factors in making field-based learning successful. For many, the "old" way is easier. Concentration on the transition and its potentialities and pitfalls requires time and sustained effort. Examining one's own leadership behaviors within the school context raises challenges we are unaccustomed to facing in traditional leadership preparation programs. The more specific and concrete these goals are, the more likely progress will result but also the more threatening and unsettling will be the changes for the leader and others. When successful, however, the professional rewards of such growth experiences run deep.

Second, **no one learning style is best in all situations.** In fact, the ability to move between styles, to stretch one's own repertoire, to appreciate diversity in learning and to take such differences into account in working with others adds versatility to leadership and richness to our schools. School leaders' learning experiences should develop tolerance and encouragement of a variety of styles so as to build upon the strengths inherent in each.

Third, **we need to move away from Style I and Style III behaviors and toward Style II in order to be able to take advantage of the many learning opportunities available in the workplace—where it ultimately counts the most.** In schools, action and near chaos bubble around the leader. The detachment initially inherent in Styles I and III can give a leader a controlling persona in an environment that resists control. Further, they can encourage dogmatic thinking in the midst of the "maelstrom" that begs for constant learning from both adults and children. Style II learning gives active leaders ways to learn and to adjust behaviors in the midst of their work.

Fourth, structures that support and place a high value on adult learning are central to our success. Our model, with its primary focus on the intrapersonal and interpersonal dimensions of leadership supported by strong cognitive knowledge, incorporates within it such support. The focus on leadership assessment as a process, the colleague-critic philosophy of the S & D Teams, the role of the facilitators, and the emphasis on practical Leadership Development Plans were central to the success of many Academy members. The opportunity to be reminded of the importance of one's own growth, to be professionally challenged and to practice what is important in one's own leadership development in a safe environment are essential. Without these, leaders cannot succeed in "unfreezing" old behaviors and replacing them with more effective ones as they go about their daily work in schools and communities.

Our challenge in Maine in the months ahead is to continue to support the efforts of Academy members to explore and further develop what we have outlined in this paper. As stewards of their own learning, these Maine leaders will continue to expand their learning through all three styles. Indeed, a community of learners and leaders must foster such diversity.

REFERENCES

Ackerman, Richard (1991). Portraits of practicum life. Presented to the Annual Meeting of AERA, April 1991.

Kolb, D. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Levine, Sarah (1989). Promoting adult growth in schools. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (1992). Developing school leaders: A call for collaboration. Reston, VA: NASSP.

National Commission for the Principalship (1990). Principals for our changing schools: Preparation and certification. Fairfax, VA: National Commission for the Principalship.

Schon, Donald (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. NY: Basic Books.

Schon, Donald (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, Thomas (1992). Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Maine Academy for School Leaders

The Maine Academy for School Leaders
A Program Sketch

	Major Goals	Structure	MASL Documents to Reference
Phase I	**Assessing My Leadership** Evaluate Leadership Strengths/Needs of School Program Staff Context Self Begin LDP Network/Group Formation	Bi-weekly sessions in Network (30) or group (15) Led by staff February-June	"The Leadership Development Plan" "Examining My Leadership" "LDP Criteria"
Phase II	**The Leadership Development Plan** Seek resources to prepare and refine LDP Form Support and Development Team (3-4) Skills Awareness Sessions/Simulations Create Entry Plans	3 Network/Group Sessions 6-day residential staff and colleague feedback S & D teams become active Led by staff, resource people June-August	Support & Development Team Goals "MASL Summer Institute" "LDP Synopsis" "Entry Plan" "S & D Team Agreement"
Phase III	**Changing My Behaviors** Pursue LDP in Workplace: modify leader behavior- evaluate - reformulate Specific "training" or resource assistance to fit LDP needs Strengthen functioning of S & D teams as colleague-critic	Workplace centered S & D teams meet/observe and feedback Facilitators work 1-1, w/ S & D's, as Network web-weavers Shoot for weekly contact Monthly Network/Academy gatherings Increasing member control over program August-May	"Talking with Colleagues About My Practice" "Taking Stock" "Evaluating our S&D Team"

9/92

Maine Academy for School Leaders

I-C-I Curriculum Model

Individuals learn about their own capabilities as leaders of others in three arenas:	Leadership Development Project (LDP) Assessing Current		Envisioning Better
INTERPERSONAL How I understand, communicate with, and behave toward others.	What is the current state of my knowledge, skills, and	← →	What ought my knowledge, skills, and attitudes to
COGNITIVE What I know about students, teachers, learning, management, and leadership theory.	attitudes?? ↓		be if I am going to lead schools toward improvement?
INTRAPERSONAL Self-knowledge and how I use it to act effectively as a leader and extend my skills.	↓ ??	← →	?? ↓ ?

- Each arena (ICI) represents a different kind of knowledge.
- Interpersonal knowledge is gained from interpersonal experience and reflection
- Ditto for intrapersonal knowledge.
- The Academy's network groups will provide some of those experiences.
- Individual LDP's will be developed and implemented with a nucleus of colleagues serving as supporters, critics, and "reflectors" of experience.